## BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

July 30, 2004

IN RE:	· .	1
PETITION	FOR ARBITRATION OF CELLCO PARTNERSHIP	DOCKET NO.
D/B/A VER	IZON WIRELESS	03-00585
PETITION	FOR ARBITRATION OF BELLSOUTH MOBILITY	
	SOUTH PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS, LLC;	,
	OOGA MSA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP;	) i
	IVELY D/B/A CINGULAR WIRELESS	•
PETITION	FOR ARBITRATION OF AT&T WIRELESS PCS, LLC	
D/B/A AT&	T WIRELESS	1
PETITION	FOR ARBITRATION OF T-MOBILE USA, INC.	) )
PETITION	FOR ARBITRATION OF SPRINT SPECTRUM L.P.	
D/B/A SPR	INT PCS	)

## ORDER GRANTING SPRINT SPECTRUM L.P. MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY

This matter came before the Pre-Arbitration Officer on the Sprint Spectrum L.P. Motion for Leave to File the Supplemental Consolidated Direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Talmage O. Cox, III ("Motion") filed by Sprint Spectrum L.P. d/b/a Sprint PCS ("Sprint PCS") on July 27, 2004. In the Motion, Sprint PCS seeks an Order allowing the filing of supplemental testimony of its expert witness, Mr. Talmage O. Cox, III. Mr. Cox's supplemental testimony was lodged with the Authority on July 27, 2004.

According to the Procedural Schedule issued on April 15, 2004, the deadline for pre-filing direct testimony in this Docket was June 3, 2004 and the deadline for pre-filing rebuttal testimony was June 24, 2004. However, the Pre-Arbitration Officer issued an *Order Granting* 

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Cox's supplemental testimony was filed as an attachment to the Motion

Motion to Compel on June 17, 2004, which ordered the production of cost studies and audited financial information from the Rural Coalition of Small LECs and Cooperatives ("Coalition"). At a Status Conference held on July 2, 2004, the Coalition was granted permission to seek interlocutory review of the Order Granting Motion to Compel as it related to the production of the audited financial statements, and the cost studies produced by the members of the Coalition were ordered to be made available to the CMRS Providers.

As a result, Sprint PCS is seeking leave to file the supplemental testimony of their expert witness on costs, Mr. Cox, on the basis that the supplemental testimony contains his analysis of the cost studies produced by the members of the Coalition. The Coalition has not objected to the Motion.<sup>2</sup>

The Pre-Arbitration Officer finds that, because the costs studies were produced after the deadlines for the pre-filing of testimony had passed, the *Motion* is well-taken and should be granted.

## IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The Sprint Spectrum L.P. Motion for Leave to File the Supplemental Consolidated Direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Talmage O Cox, III is granted.
- 2. The Supplemental Consolidated Direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Talmage O. Cox, III on Behalf of Sprint Spectrum L.P. d/b/a Sprint PCS, lodged with the Authority on July 27, 2004, is accepted as filed.

Jean A. Stone, Counsel as Pre-Arbitration Officer

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Coalition stated it did not object to the *Motion* at a Status Conference held on July 29, 2004.